

**REMARKS**

In the January 29, 2008 Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “UPnP AV Architecture: 0.83” to Ritchie et al. (“*Ritchie*”) in view of “ContentDirectory: 1 Service Template Version 1.01 to Debique et al. (“*Debique*”); rejected claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique* and further in view of “Playing Audio on Your PPC From Your Desktop” to Conger et al. (“*Conger*”); and rejected claims 40 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique* and further in view of “Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1” to Fielding et al. (“*Fielding*”). Furthermore, the Examiner maintained these rejections in the March 31, 2008 Advisory Action.<sup>1</sup>

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended claims 30-32, 39-42, 44-47, 51-54, and 56-58. Claims 30-58 remain pending and under current examination.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, neither *Ritchie* nor *Debique*, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of Applicant’s claims.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

For example, amended independent claim 30 recites a content providing server comprising, among other things a content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client.

According to *Ritchie*, “MediaServers are capable of transferring multiple content items at the same time, e.g. a hard-disk-based audio jukebox may be able to simultaneously stream multiple audio files to the network. In order to support this type of MediaServer, the ConnectionManager assigns a unique Connection ID to each “connection” (i.e. each stream) that is made.” *Ritchie* at page 7, Section 5.1. Prior to transferring multiple contents, each content in *Ritchie* is assigned a unique connection ID and each content is transferred over a separate stream. *Ritchie* does not stream content “over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator),” as recited in claim 30.

Furthermore, according to *Debique* “a ‘playlistContainer’ may contain a mix of audio, video and images and is typically created by a user . . . A ‘playlistContainer’ may have a <res> element for playback of the whole playlist or not . . . In any case, rendering the playlist has the semantics defined by the playlist resource (e.g., ordering, transition effects, etc.),” (emphasis added). *Debique* at page 87, Section 7.1. *Debique* uses a unique object id assigned to each object enumerated in the playlistContainer to individually play each data object on various rendering devices in a particular order.

*Debique*, does not stream content “over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator),” as recited in claim 30. Therefore, both *Debique* and *Ritchie* assign unique identifications to individual contents and individually transfer or separately stream individual contents identified by individual content IDs.

Because neither *Debique* nor *Ritchie*, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element recited by independent claim 30 and required by dependent claims 31 and 33-38, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for these claims. Independent claims 42, 45, 54, and 57-58, although of different scope from claim 31, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for independent claims 42, 45, 54, and 57-58 and dependent claims 43, 46, 48-50, and 55. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Debique* in view of *Ritchie*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*, and further in view of *Conger* and the rejection of claims 40 and 52 as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*, and further in view of *Fielding*.

Claims 32, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 52, 53, and 56 depend from one of the independent claims 30, 42, 45, and 54. *Conger* and *Fielding*, taken individually or in combination, fail to cure the deficiencies of *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*, nor does the Examiner rely on these references for such teachings. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case

of obviousness has been established with respect to independent claims 30, 42, 45, and 54 and dependent claims 32, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 52, 53, and 56. Applicant therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 25, 2008

By: 

Michael Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921